submitted beyond the fifteen-day deadline.

No. 19.) 1

2

ARGUMENT

3

Plaintiff's Claim That He Timely Filed His Appeal Is Not Supported by the Evidence.

4 5

Defendant asserts that Plaintiff failed to file his appeal, institutional log number SVSP-D-07-01389 timely, over forty-four days after the incident, and therefore failed to exhaust his administrative remedies as required under PLRA. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

7 8

6

In Plaintiff's opposition, he claims that he submitted the appeal, institutional log number SVSP-D-07-01389, on February 28, 2007, and sixteen-days after the February 12, 2007 incident. (See Plaintiff's Opp., CD No. 19, at 11.) Defendants contend that he filed his untimely appeal on March 28, 2007 and well beyond the fifteen-day deadline and failed to properly exhaust his administrative remedies. First, in Plaintiff's Exhibit B. (See Defendants' Mot. to Dismiss, CD No. 14, at 7:4-16.) Defendant's contentions are supported by the Plaintiff's Exhibit B that shows on the Inmate Appeals Tracking System that institutional log number SVSP-D-07-01389 was received on March 28, 2007. (See Plaintiff's Opp., CD No. 19., Ex. B.) It is also supported by Defendants' submission of Plaintiff's appeal, institutional log number SVSP-D-01389, that shows the stamped received date of March 28, 2007. (See Medina Decl., CD 15, Ex. B.) The evidence by both Plaintiff and Defendants supports the conclusion that Plaintiff's appeal was

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

The Court may look beyond the pleadings and decide disputed issues of fact when ruling on Defendant's non-enumerated Rule 12(b) motion for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003). In Woodford v. Ngo, the Supreme Court held that the PLRA's exhaustion requirement requires the "proper exhaustion" of administrative remedies. Woodford, 548 U.S. 81, (2006). "Proper exhaustion demands compliance with an agency's deadlines and other critical procedural rules because no adjudicative system can function effectively without imposing some orderly structure on the course of its proceedings." Id.

27 28

As such, Plaintiff's argument that he met the required deadline and exhausted his Def.'s Reply to Plaintiff's Opp. to Mot. To Dismiss

Rojas v. Loza, et al. C 07-4662 MMC

Def.'s Reply to Plaintiff's Opp. to Mot. To Dismiss

25

26

27

28

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL

Case Name: Rojas v. Loza, et al.

No.: C 07-4662 MMC

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On September 8, 2008, I served the attached

DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004, addressed as follows:

Jahir Alberto Rojas, P-58734 California State Prison - Corcoran P. O. Box 8800 Corcoran, CA 93212 Pro Per

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on September 8, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

T. Oakes	/s/ T. Oakes
Declarant	Signature

20140831.wpd